

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above referenced application in view of the following remarks is requested. Claims 1, 3-4, 15, 17-18, 24, 37, 39-40, 51, and 53-54 have been amended. Claims 2, 8-14, 16, 21-23, 25, 28-30, 34-36, 38, 44-50, 52, and 57-59 have been cancelled. Existing claims 1, 3-7, 15, 17-20, 24, 26-27, 31-33, 37, 39-43, 51, and 53-56 remain in the application.

ARGUMENT

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-4, 7-10, 14-20, 24-33, 37-40, 43-46, and 50-56 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Wolf et al. (PGPUB 2003/0204399) (hereinafter Wolf).

Claims 21-23, 34-36, and 57-59 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Thong et al. (USPN 6,985,861) (hereinafter Van Thong).

Claims 2, 8-10, 16, 25, 28-30, 38, 44-46, 52, and 57-59 have been cancelled. Rejections of these claims are now moot.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate all of the limitations recited in original claim 2 and claim 2 has been cancelled. When rejecting original claim 2, the Examiner asserted that Wolf, particularly column 2, paragraph 0021 and column 3, paragraphs 0033-0040, discloses the limitation of calculating a second score for each of the K-best phoneme paths for the frame. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Column 2, paragraph 0021 of Wolf discloses determining confidence scores as an alternative approach to the word-level lattice based approach. Even if assuming that the

confidence score in paragraph 0021 of Wolf is equivalent to the second score recited in original claim 2 for the argument purposes, Wolf specifically teaches away of calculating the second score after a first score has been computed because calculating the confidence score is only an alternative option. In other words, Wolf does not compute both the first score and the second score but only one of them.

Because Wolf does not disclose at least one limitation in independent claim 1, as currently amended, Wolf does not anticipate this amended claim. Independent claims 15, 24, 37, and 51, as currently amended, all includes the limitation of calculating a second score for each of the K-best phoneme paths for the frame. For reasons similar to those presented above, Wolf does not disclose at least this limitation. Thus, these independent claims are not anticipated by Wolf either. Accordingly, all of the claims that depend therefrom (i.e., claims 3-4, 7, 14, 17-20, 26-27, 39-40, 43, and 53-56) are not anticipated by Wolf either. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

Regarding independent claim 31, the Examiner asserted that column 3, paragraphs 0033-0040 of Wolf discloses all of the limitations recited in this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Wolf at least does not disclose the client and server aspect of this claim. Particularly, Wolf does not disclose what workload (e.g., receiving an input speech signal and constructing a phoneme lattice for the received input speech signal) is performed by a client and what (e.g., searching the phoneme lattice) is performed by a server. Because Wolf does not disclose all of the elements recited in this independent claim, this claim is not anticipated by Wolf. Accordingly, all of the

claims that depend therefrom (i.e., claims 32-33) are not anticipated by Wolf either. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejections of claims 31-33 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Caims 5-6, 11-13, 41-42, and 47-49 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolf in view of Van Thong.

Claims 47-49 have been cancelled. Thus, the rejections of these claims are now moot.

Wolf is the sole reference which the Examiner asserted teaches all of the limitations recited in claims 5-6 and 11-13's parent independent claim 1 and all of the limitations recited in claims 41-42's parent independent claim 37. Based on the arguments presented above in traversing the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections of claims 1 and 37, Wolf does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in claims 1 or 37. Van Thong was not cited to fix those deficiencies in Wolf. Thus, the combination of Wolf and Van Thong does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in claims 5-6, 11-13, and 41-42. These claims are patentable over Wolf in view Van Thong. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that that all active claims are presently in condition for allowance, and their passage to issuance is respectfully solicited. If the

Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 264-1700. Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 29, 2007

/Guojun Zhou/
Guojun Zhou
Registration No. 56,478
INTEL CORPORATION
MS JF3-147
2111 NE 25th Ave.
Hillsboro, OR. 97124

Application No.: 10/616,310
Filed: July 07, 2003

14

Examiner: Jackson, J.
Art Unit: 2626